UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA SOUTHERN DIVISION NO. 7:11-CR-117-BR

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

ORDER

BRENDON EVAN HOLE

This matter is before the court on defendant's two, virtually identical *pro se* motions to reduce his sentence pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582. (DE ## 59, 60.)

Defendant contends that "due to the newly passed law affording two (2) point reduction, [his] guide line range is no longer 70-87, but is now 57-71 months." (DE # 59, at 1.) The court presumes defendant relies on the recent amendment to the sentencing guidelines, Amendment 782, which generally reduces by two levels the offense levels in U.S.S.G. § 2D1.1(c)'s Drug Quantity Table. But, defendant's offense level was not based on § 2D1.1(c) because he was not convicted of a drug trafficking offense. Rather, it was based on § 2K2.1 because he was convicted of two counts of being a felon in possession of firearm. (PSR, DE # 37, ¶ 55.) Therefore, Amendment 782 has no effect on defendant's guideline imprisonment range, and the court is not authorized to reduce his sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2), see

¹ This amendment is applied retroactively; however, the effective date of any court's order reducing a term of imprisonment based on the amendment must be 1 November 2015 or later. U.S.S.G. § 1B1.10, comment. (n.6) (2014).

² Although § 2K2.1 has also recently been amended, the amendment clarifies how the four-level enhancement under subsection (b)(6)(B) applies, see U.S.S.G., App. C., Supp., Amend. 784, and it does not apply retroactively, see U.S.S.G. § 1B1.10(d) (2014).

<u>United States v. Munn</u>, 595 F.3d 183, 187 (4th Cir. 2010) ("[A] reduction under § 3582(c)(2) 'is not authorized' if an amendment 'does not have the effect of lowering the defendant's applicable guideline range." (citations omitted)).

The motions are DENIED.

This 30 March 2015.

W. Earl Britt

Senior U.S. District Judge